

since the articles would not supply any glandular or enzymic activity and would have no therapeutic significance when consumed as directed in the labeling, "3 to 5 tablets daily or as directed by a Specialist," except for the content of iron in the *Glanzyme No. 2*; and the following statements on the bottle labels of the articles and in the booklet were misleading since the articles, when consumed as directed, would produce no therapeutic effect, and the listed ingredients were therefore not active except as to the ingredient, reduced iron, in the *Glanzyme No. 2*: (*Glanzyme No. 1*) "Active Ingredients Ovarian Residue 3 Gr. Whole Suprarenal 1 Gr. Anterior Pituitary ½ Gr. Kelp 1 Gr. Alfalfa 2 Gr. Papain (Papaya-Enzyme) 1 Gr."; (*Glanzyme No. 2*) "Active Ingredients Mammary 3 Gr. Placenta 2 Gr. Whole Pituitary ½ Gr. Kelp 1 Gr. Papain (Papaya-Enzyme) 1 Gr. Alfalfa 2 Gr. Reduced Iron ½ Gr. (22 Mg.)"; (*Glanzyme No. 3*) "Active Ingredients Orchic 4 Gr. Prostate 2 Gr. Whole Suprarenal 1 Gr. Anterior Pituitary ½ Gr. Kelp 1 Gr. Papain (Papaya-Enzyme) 1 Gr. Alfalfa 1 Gr."; (*Glanzyme No. 6*) "Active Ingredients Whole suprarenal 2 Gr. Papain (Papaya-Enzyme) ½ Gr. Kelp 1½ Gr. Alfalfa 4 Gr."

DISPOSITION: May 8, 1945. The sole intervener having consented to the entry of a decree, judgment of condemnation was entered and the products, together with the booklet, were ordered destroyed.

1640. Misbranding of SNJ Sulfathiazole Nasal Jelly. U. S. v. 11½ Dozen, 11¼ Dozen, and 11½ Dozen Packages of SNJ Sulfathiazole Nasal Jelly. Default decrees of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. Nos. 15799, 15800, 16063. Sample Nos. 6329-H, 27351-H, 27352-H.)

LIBELS FILED: April 16 and 26, 1945, District of Oregon and Eastern District of New York.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: Between the approximate dates of July 21, 1944, and February 12, 1945, by the S. N. J. Products Co., from Los Angeles, Calif.

PRODUCT: 23 dozen packages of *SNJ Sulfathiazole Nasal Jelly* at Portland, Oreg., and 11¼ dozen packages of the same product at Brooklyn, N. Y. Examination disclosed that the product possessed the composition stated upon its label.

LABEL, IN PART: "SNJ Sulfathiazole Nasal Jelly * * * Contains 3% Sodium Sulfathiazole and ¼% Benzoate of Soda in a water soluble base."

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements on the label and in the circular entitled, "Directions For Use," enclosed in the package, were false and misleading since they represented and suggested that the article would be an adequate treatment for the various disease conditions affecting the nose and throat; and that it would be effective in the relief and prevention of colds and sinus trouble. The article would not be an adequate treatment, and it would not be effective for the conditions represented. The name of the article was misleading since its labeling failed to reveal the fact, material in the light of such name, that the article was not, because of its sulfathiazole content, of value for disease conditions affecting the nose.

DISPOSITION: May 24 and June 23, 1945. No claimant having appeared, judgments of condemnation were entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

1641. Misbranding of Sinudrene. U. S. v. 5 Dozen Bottles and 3¾ Dozen Bottles of Sinudrene. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. D. C. No. 15085. Sample Nos. 93228-F, 93229-F.)

LIBEL FILED: January 25, 1945, Southern District of West Virginia.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about April 17 and November 28, 1944, by Davart Products, from Ashland, Ky.

PRODUCT: 5 dozen 1-ounce bottles and 3¾ dozen 2-ounce bottles of *Sinudrene* at Charleston, W. Va. Examination of samples disclosed that the product consisted essentially of ephedrine, water, glycerin, small amounts of phenol and iodides, and trace of malachite green.

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the label statements, "Sinudrene * * * for the relief of painful and congested sinus conditions. Promotes Drainage * * * In severe cases * * * allow Sinudrene to penetrate the sinuses more quickly. * * * Simple Hay Fever and Catarrh," were false and misleading since the product would not be effective in the treatment of painful and congested sinus conditions, hay fever, and catarrh, and would not be effective to promote drainage.